



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative in an effort to clarify and hopefully resolve via a clarifying amendment the features claimed by applicant, as opposed to the features argued in the MARCH 18th 2005 response. No resolution resulted and the attorney requested an advisory action of each of the examiner's concerns. The advisory action accompanies this response. The examiner suggested that some problems may be resolved by clarification of applicant's claim terminology, or exchanging terminology causing confusion with equivalent, wording that better clarifies the actual invention. Applicant's representative indicated an Advisory was needed prior to any correction by applicant. The examiner agreed but noted that the finality of the last office action stands and is being maintained by the examiner, in view of what the finally rejected claims actually recite and require, as opposed to limitations argued but not clearly recited in applicant's claims..

Ex. Tiffany A. Tuzza  
AU2859  
(571) 272-2244